

11-09-00

A

11/07/00

jc921 U.S. PTO
09/708244
11/07/00

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING

Attorney Docket No.: STRATP002

First Named Inventor: Owen, Daniel L.

Transmittal and the documents and/or fees itemized hereon and
hereto have been deposited as "Express Mail Post Office to
Addressee" in accordance with 37 CFR §1.10 with Mailing Label
Number **EL052726297US**.

UTILITY PATENT APPLICATION TRANSMITTAL (37 CFR. § 1.53(b))
(Regular application claiming priority of a provisional)

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Box Patent Application
Washington, DC 20231

☐ Duplicate for
fee processing

Sir: This is a request for filing a patent application under 37 CFR. § 1.53(b) in the name of inventors:
Daniel L. Owen and Michael W. Kusnic

For: **SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR A CUSTOMER-
CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE PROTOCOL**

Priority of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/163,984 filed on November 8, 1999 is claimed under 35
U.S.C. § 119(e).

Application Elements:

- ☒ 39 Pages of Specification, Claims and Abstract
☒ 49 Sheets of **formal/informal** Drawings
☒ Combined Declaration and Power of Attorney
☐ Separate Declaration

Accompanying Application Parts:

- ☒ Assignment and Assignment Recordation Cover Sheet (recording fee of \$40.00 enclosed)
☐ Separate Power of Attorney by Assignee
☐ 37 CFR 3.73(b) Statement by Assignee
☐ Information Disclosure Statement with Form PTO-1449
☐ Copies of IDS Citations
☐ Preliminary Amendment
☒ Return Receipt Postcard
☒ Small Entity Statement(s)
☐ Other:

Claim For Foreign Priority

☐ Priority of _____ Application No. _____ filed on _____
_____ is claimed under 35 U.S.C. § 119.

☐ The certified copy is enclosed.

☐ The certified copy will follow.

☐ Amend the specification by inserting before the first line the sentence:

“This application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/163,984
filed on 11/8/99, the disclosure of which is incorporated herein by reference.”

Fee Calculation (37 CFR § 1.16)

	(Col. 1)	(Col. 2)	SMALL ENTITY	OR	LARGE ENTITY
	NO. FILED	NO. EXTRA	RATE	FEE	RATE FEE
BASIC FEE	<u>17</u>	<u>20</u>	\$355	\$355	OR \$710 \$
TOTAL CLAIMS	<u>17</u>	-20 = <u>00</u>	x09 = \$	OR	x18 = \$
INDEP CLAIMS	<u>03</u>	-03 = <u>00</u>	x40 = \$	OR	x80 = \$
<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple Dependent Claim Presented			\$135 = \$	OR	\$270 = \$
If the difference in Col. 1 is less than zero, enter "0" in Col. 2.			Total \$355	OR	Total \$

☒ Check No. 243 in the amount of \$395.00 is enclosed.

☐ No fees enclosed, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-1351

☐ The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees beyond the amount enclosed which may be required, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. STRATP002).

General Authorization for Petition for Extension of Time (37 CFR §1.136)

☒ Applicants hereby make and generally authorize any Petitions for Extensions of Time as may be needed for any subsequent filings. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any extension fees under 37 CFR §1.17 as may be needed to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. STRATP002).

☒ Please send correspondence to the following address:

Kevin J. Zilka
P.O. Box 721030
San Jose, CA 95172-1030

Tel (408) 505-5100



24277

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Customer No.:

Date: 11/07/2000



Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

Applicant/Patentee: Daniel L. Owen & Michael W. Kusnic
Application or Patent No. Unassigned Attorney Docket No. STRATP002
Filed or Issued: _____

**VERIFIED STATEMENT (DECLARATION) CLAIMING SMALL ENTITY STATUS
37 CFR §1.9(f) and §1.27(c)--SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN**

I hereby declare that I am

☐ the owner of the small business concern identified below:

☒ an official empowered to act on behalf of the small business concern identified below:

NAME OF CONCERN: Customer Decision Platform, LLC

ADDRESS: P. O. Box 22, Lakeville, Michigan 48366

I hereby declare that the above identified small business concern qualifies as a small business concern as defined in 13 CFR §121.3-18, and reproduced in 37 CFR §1.9(d), for purposes of paying reduced fees under 41(a) and (b) of Title 35, U.S. Code, in that the number of employees of the concern, including those of its affiliates, does not exceed 500 persons. For purposes of this statement, (1) the number of employees of the business concern is the average over the previous fiscal year of the concern of the persons employed on a full-time, part-time or temporary basis during each of the pay periods of the fiscal year, and (2) concerns are affiliates of each other when either, directly or indirectly, one concern controls or has the power to control the other, or a third party or parties controls or has the power to control both.

I hereby declare that rights under contract or law have been conveyed to and remain with the small business concern identified above with regard to the invention entitled: SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR A CUSTOMER-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE PROTOCOL, by inventor(s) Daniel L. Owen and Michael W. Kusnic, described in:

☒ the specification filed herewith.

☐ Application No. _____ filed _____

☐ Patent No. _____ issued _____

If the rights held by the above-identified small business concern are not exclusive, each individual, concern or organization having rights to the invention is listed below* and no rights to the invention are held by any person, other than the inventor, who could not qualify as a small business concern under 37 CFR §1.9(d) or by any concern which would not qualify as a small business concern under 37 CFR §1.9(d) or a nonprofit organization under 37 CFR §1.9(e).

Note: separate verified statements are required from each named person, concern or organization having rights to the invention averring to their status as small entities. (37 CFR §1.27)

Name: _____

Address: _____

☐ individual ☒ small business concern ☐ nonprofit organization

I acknowledge the duty to file, in this application or patent, notification of any change in status resulting in loss of entitlement to small entity status prior to paying, or at the time of paying, the earliest of the issue fee or any maintenance fee due after the date on which status as a small entity is no longer appropriate. (37 CFR §1.28(b)).

NAME OF PERSON SIGNING: Daniel L. Owen

TITLE IN ORGANIZATION: MANAGING DIRECTOR

ADDRESS OF PERSON SIGNING: P.O. Box 22, Lakeville, Michigan 48366

SIGNATURE Daniel Owen DATE 11/03/00

TITLE IN ORGANIZATION: MANAGING DIRECTOR

ADDRESS OF PERSON SIGNING: P.O. Box 22, Lakeville, Michigan 48366

SIGNATURE Daniel Owen DATE 11/03/00

Attorney Docket No. STRATP002

```
Source::  PrintEFS  Version 1.0.1
```

1. **Introduction**
 2. **Background**
 3. **Methodology**
 4. **Results**
 5. **Discussion**
 6. **Conclusion**
 7. **References**
 8. **Appendix**
 9. **Figure 1**
 10. **Figure 2**
 11. **Figure 3**
 12. **Figure 4**
 13. **Figure 5**
 14. **Figure 6**
 15. **Figure 7**
 16. **Figure 8**
 17. **Figure 9**
 18. **Figure 10**
 19. **Figure 11**
 20. **Figure 12**
 21. **Figure 13**
 22. **Figure 14**
 23. **Figure 15**
 24. **Figure 16**
 25. **Figure 17**
 26. **Figure 18**
 27. **Figure 19**
 28. **Figure 20**
 29. **Figure 21**
 30. **Figure 22**
 31. **Figure 23**
 32. **Figure 24**
 33. **Figure 25**
 34. **Figure 26**
 35. **Figure 27**
 36. **Figure 28**
 37. **Figure 29**
 38. **Figure 30**
 39. **Figure 31**
 40. **Figure 32**
 41. **Figure 33**
 42. **Figure 34**
 43. **Figure 35**
 44. **Figure 36**
 45. **Figure 37**
 46. **Figure 38**
 47. **Figure 39**
 48. **Figure 40**
 49. **Figure 41**
 50. **Figure 42**
 51. **Figure 43**
 52. **Figure 44**
 53. **Figure 45**
 54. **Figure 46**
 55. **Figure 47**
 56. **Figure 48**
 57. **Figure 49**
 58. **Figure 50**
 59. **Figure 51**
 60. **Figure 52**
 61. **Figure 53**
 62. **Figure 54**
 63. **Figure 55**
 64. **Figure 56**
 65. **Figure 57**
 66. **Figure 58**
 67. **Figure 59**
 68. **Figure 60**
 69. **Figure 61**
 70. **Figure 62**
 71. **Figure 63**
 72. **Figure 64**
 73. **Figure 65**
 74. **Figure 66**
 75. **Figure 67**
 76. **Figure 68**
 77. **Figure 69**
 78. **Figure 70**
 79. **Figure 71**
 80. **Figure 72**
 81. **Figure 73**
 82. **Figure 74**
 83. **Figure 75**
 84. **Figure 76**
 85. **Figure 77**
 86. **Figure 78**
 87. **Figure 79**
 88. **Figure 80**
 89. **Figure 81**
 90. **Figure 82**
 91. **Figure 83**
 92. **Figure 84**
 93. **Figure 85**
 94. **Figure 86**
 95. **Figure 87**
 96. **Figure 88**
 97. **Figure 89**
 98. **Figure 90**
 99. **Figure 91**
 100. **Figure 92**
 101. **Figure 93**
 102. **Figure 94**
 103. **Figure 95**
 104. **Figure 96**
 105. **Figure 97**
 106. **Figure 98**
 107. **Figure 99**
 108. **Figure 100**
 109. **Figure 101**
 110. **Figure 102**
 111. **Figure 103**
 112. **Figure 104**
 113. **Figure 105**
 114. **Figure 106**
 115. **Figure 107**
 116. **Figure 108**
 117. **Figure 109**
 118. **Figure 110**
 119. **Figure 111**
 120. **Figure 112**
 121. **Figure 113**
 122. **Figure 114**
 123. **Figure 115**
 124. **Figure 116**
 125. **Figure 117**
 126. **Figure 118**
 127. **Figure 119**
 128. **Figure 120**
 129. **Figure 121**
 130. **Figure 122**
 131. **Figure 123**
 132. **Figure 124**
 133. **Figure 125**
 134. **Figure 126**
 135. **Figure 127**
 136. **Figure 128**
 137. **Figure 129**
 138. **Figure 130**
 139. **Figure 131**
 140. **Figure 132**
 141. **Figure 133**
 142. **Figure 134**
 143. **Figure 135**
 144. **Figure 136**
 145. **Figure 137**
 146. **Figure 138**
 147. **Figure 139**
 148. **Figure 140**
 149. **Figure 141**
 150. **Figure 142**
 151. **Figure 143**
 152. **Figure 144**
 153. **Figure 145**
 154. **Figure 146**
 155. **Figure 147**
 156. **Figure 148**
 157. **Figure 149**
 158. **Figure 150**
 159. **Figure 151**
 160. **Figure 152**
 161. **Figure 153**
 162. **Figure 154**
 163. **Figure 155**
 164. **Figure 156**
 165. **Figure 157**
 166. **Figure 158**
 167. **Figure 159**
 168. **Figure 160**
 169. **Figure 161**
 170. **Figure 162**
 171. **Figure 163**
 172. **Figure 164**
 173. **Figure 165**
 174. **Figure 166**
 175. **Figure 167**
 176. **Figure 168**
 177. **Figure 169**
 178. **Figure 170**
 179. **Figure 171**
 180. **Figure 172**
 181. **Figure 173**
 182. **Figure 174**
 183. **Figure 175**
 184. **Figure 176**
 185. **Figure 177**
 186. **Figure 178**
 187. **Figure 179**
 188. **Figure 180**
 189. **Figure 181**
 190. **Figure 182**
 191. **Figure 183**
 192. **Figure 184**
 193. **Figure 185**
 194. **Figure 186**
 195. **Figure 187**
 196. **Figure 188**
 197. **Figure 189**
 198. **Figure 190**
 199. **Figure 191**
 200. **Figure 192**
 201. **Figure 193**
 202. **Figure 194**
 203. **Figure 195**
 204. **Figure 196**
 205. **Figure 197**
 206. **Figure 198**
 207. **Figure 199**
 208. **Figure 200**
 209. **Figure 201**
 210. **Figure 202**
 211. **Figure 203**
 212. **Figure 204**
 213. **Figure 205**
 214. **Figure 206**
 215. **Figure 207**
 216. **Figure 208**
 217. **Figure 209**

INVENTOR(S):
Daniel L. Owen
Michael W. Kusnic

KEVIN J. ZILKA
PATENT AGENT
P.O. BOX 721030
SAN JOSE, CA 95172

SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR A CUSTOMER-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE PROTOCOL

5

RELATED APPLICATION(S)

The present application claims the priority of a previously filed provisional application with the title "Collaborative Decision Platform" filed November 8, 1999 under serial number 60/163,984, which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety. The present application is further related to an application filed concurrently herewith under the title "System, Method and Computer Program Product for a Collaborative Decision Platform" by inventors Daniel L. Owen and Michael W. Kusnic under docket number STRATP001, which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety.

FIELD OF THE INVENTION

The present invention relates to decision-making logic, and more particularly to a computer-based platform that supports a decision making process and business-to-business exchanges.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

Historically, enterprises have used "Make and Sell" to define their products and services. Prior art Figure 1a illustrates an example of the make and sell approach. As shown, a technical or marketing organization 10 makes specifications or requirements for an enterprise 12 which, in turn, generates a product or service for being sold to a consumer 14. The technical or marketing organization 10 may produce the specifications or requirements based on information about the customer,

as shown. Within the enterprise there may be a formal structure for collection of information about customers, but that structure is not common or “scalable” across enterprises.

5 A new model of collaborative decision making, which is “Market-based”,
has proven very effective for delivering more valuable products and services to
consumers. Figure 1b illustrates an example of a market-based approach of the prior
art. As shown, an intermediate collaborative decision making process 16 receives
the value or needs of the consumer 14. Also, the enterprise 12 provides such
10 intermediate collaborative decision making process 16 with product/service
alternatives based on the capabilities of its technical or marketing organizations 10.
The intermediate collaborative decision making process 16 in turn contributes in
forming an agreement among the decision-makers within the enterprise 12 to
produce high-value products and services for the consumer.

15 While this model has been proven for consumer-to-business frameworks, no
work has been done to extend this model to business-to-business (B2B) frameworks
in a manner that operates effectively. In a B2B framework, the customer is another
business rather than a consumer. There is therefore a need for a computer
20 implemented business method for providing a consumer centric collaborative
protocol.

DISCLOSURE OF THE INVENTION

A system, method and computer program product are provided for affording customer-centric collaborative decision making in a business-to-business framework. Initially, a minimum set of attributes is defined. Thereafter, first information regarding each of the minimum set of attributes is received from a receiving business. Second information is then received regarding proposed products or services in terms of the minimum set of attributes. Such second information is received from a supplying business. In use, a decision process is executed based on the first information and the second information as to which products or services most valuable to the receiving business.

In one embodiment of the present invention, the attributes include price, sales, variable costs, fixed cost, and investment. Further, the attributes may also include market share, market size, labor cost, material cost, administrative cost, annual expenses, working capital, planning and equipment, etc. As an option, the first information and second information may be received utilizing a network. Such network may take the form of the Internet.

In still another embodiment of the present invention, the foregoing capabilities may be carried out using a collaborative decision platform adapted to run on a computer. In such system, an application capable of performing decision logic is executed. Information is then retrieved from a database in accordance with the decision logic. Information is then provided to and received from users in accordance with the decision logic utilizing a user interface. The information is then processed utilizing the decision logic. In use, the foregoing steps are carried out by a collaborative decision platform capable of retrieving and receiving the information, and processing such information for different purposes by executing different applications each capable of performing different decision logic. It should be noted

that the various steps set forth hereinabove may be carried out using universal modules capable of interfacing with different applications.

5

09708244-110700

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

Figures **1a** and **1b** illustrate prior art systems;

5

Figure **1c** illustrates a method for providing a collaborative decision platform adapted to run on a computer;

Figure **1d** illustrates a system by which the method of Figure **1c** may be carried out;

10

Figure **1e** illustrates a networked decision making environment in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention;

15

Figure **2** shows a representative hardware environment on which the collaborative decision platform of Figure **1d** may be implemented;

Figure **3** illustrates an example of Framing in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention;

20

Figure **3a** illustrates various logic associated with the Framing process of the present invention;

Figure **4** illustrates an example of Alternatives in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention;

25

Figure **4a** illustrates various logic associated with the Alternatives process of the present invention which is capable of handling its various input for the purpose of generating a strategy table;

30

Figure 5a illustrates various logic associated with the Analysis process of the
5 present invention;

Figure 6a illustrates various logic associated with the Connection process of the present invention;

Figure 7 illustrates the various logical connectivity between the various inputs and outputs of the Framing, Alternatives, Analysis, and Connection logic that comprises the users' interface;

Figures 8a-i illustrate an example of an application of the various logic components set forth in Figures 3-7;

Figure 9 illustrates a method for affording customer-centric collaborative decision making in a business-to-business framework;

Figures 9a and 10 illustrates tables associated with the method of Figure 9;

Figure 11 is a schematic diagram showing the customer-centric collaborative protocol;

Figure 12 illustrates a first example of the embodiment set forth in Figure 11;

Figure 13 illustrates a second example of the embodiment set forth in Figure 11;

Figures 14 and 15 illustrate third and fourth examples, respectively, of the embodiment set forth in Figure 11, where an industry independent, open and scalable platform is provided for business-to business exchange of existing goods and services that are not commodities;

Figure 16 illustrates a fifth example of the embodiment set forth in Figure 11, where an industry independent, open and scalable platform is provided for B2B real-time collaboration in the definition of future, non-existent goods and services;

Figures 17 and 18 illustrate sixth and seventh examples, respectively, of the embodiment set forth in Figure 11, where a new business design is provided that assists business-to business enterprises in measuring the value creation for its customers; and

Figures 19 through 30 illustrate an exemplary application of the customer centric collaborative protocol.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS

Figure 1c illustrates a method 100 for providing a collaborative decision
5 platform adapted to run on a computer. Initially, an application capable of
performing decision logic is executed. See operation 102.

Information is then retrieved from a database in accordance with the decision
logic, as indicated in operation 104. Information is then delivered to and received
10 from a user in accordance with the decision logic utilizing a user interface. Note
operation 106. The information is then processed in operation 108 utilizing the
decision logic.

In use, the foregoing steps are carried out by a collaborative decision
15 platform capable of retrieving and receiving the information, and processing such
information for different purposes by executing different applications each capable
of performing different decision logic. Note operation 110. It should be noted that
the various steps set forth hereinabove may be carried out using universal modules
capable of interfacing with different applications.

20
Figure 1d illustrates a system 120 by which the foregoing method of Figure
1c may be carried out. As shown, a collaborative decision platform 122 is provided
which has an interface 125 with at least one application 124 for executing the
decision logic, as set forth in operation 102 of Figure 1c. Further included is a
25 database 126, which has an interface 127 with the collaborative decision platform
122 in accordance with operation 104 of Figure 1c. Further, a user interface 128 is
provided for receiving information from and providing information to the users. The
interfaces 125, 127, and 128 are defined by the collaborative decision platform 122.
The users may be an important element of the system 120. Note the two-headed
30 arrow representing the users' interface 128 with the collaborative decision platform

122 to indicate the interaction, while the single arrowhead of the interface 125 and 127 indicates input. Note operation 106 of Figure 1c. The collaborative decision platform 122 may be run on any type of hardware architecture 130.

5 As set forth earlier, the various steps of Figure 1c may be carried out using universal modules capable of interfacing with different applications. Such different applications 124 may be capable of performing decision logic relating to any type of decision-making process (e.g. financial, medical, buying a house, selecting a corporate strategy, etc.). In use, the collaborative decision platform 122 enables
10 decision-making processes through the sequence and connectivity of a set of common displays, which describes the decision to be made. The collaborative decision platform 122 further enables asynchronous, remote decision-making processes, i.e. the ability to have different people input data into the set of common displays at different times, and from different places. Further, the database 126 may
15 take the form of any one or a plurality of databases which may or may not be interconnected via a network such as the Internet. To this end, the present embodiment is designed to foster clear and conscientious decision-making.

 Figure 1e illustrates a plurality of network 130 of decision environments for
20 allowing enterprises to learn more rapidly and coordinate more effectively. Such a network of decision environments each include at least one collaborative user interface which each communicate with an enterprise learning and coordination module 132 that may include one or more collaborative decision platforms 122. Such a network 130 may allow the decision environments to be a physical
25 arrangement optimized for human decision making or a virtual environment consisting of only the computer hardware and the collaborative decision platform 122.

 Figure 2 shows a representative hardware environment on which the
30 collaborative decision platform 122 of Figure 1d may be implemented. Such figure

illustrates a typical hardware configuration of a workstation in accordance with a preferred embodiment having a central processing unit **210**, such as a microprocessor, and a number of other units interconnected via a system bus **212**.

5 The workstation shown in Figure 2 includes a Random Access Memory (RAM) **214**, Read Only Memory (ROM) **216**, an I/O adapter **218** for connecting peripheral devices such as disk storage units **220** to the bus **212**, a user interface adapter **222** for connecting a keyboard **224**, a mouse **226**, a speaker **228**, a microphone **232**, and/or other user interface devices such as a touch screen (not
10 shown) to the bus **212**, communication adapter **234** for connecting the workstation to a communication network **235** (e.g., a data processing network) and a display adapter **236** for connecting the bus **212** to a display device **238**.

 The workstation typically has resident thereon an operating system such as
15 the Microsoft Windows NT or Windows/95 Operating System (OS), the IBM OS/2 operating system, the MAC OS, or UNIX operating system. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the present invention may also be implemented on platforms and operating systems other than those mentioned.

20 A preferred embodiment is written using JAVA, C, and the C++ language and utilizes object oriented programming methodology. Object oriented programming (OOP) has become increasingly used to develop complex applications. As OOP moves toward the mainstream of software design and development, various software solutions require adaptation to make use of the benefits of OOP. A need
25 exists for these principles of OOP to be applied to a messaging interface of an electronic messaging system such that a set of OOP classes and objects for the messaging interface can be provided.

OOP is a process of developing computer software using objects, including the steps of analyzing the problem, designing the system, and constructing the program. An object is a software package that contains both data and a collection of related structures and procedures. Since it contains both data and a collection of structures and procedures, it can be visualized as a self-sufficient component that does not require other additional structures, procedures or data to perform its specific task. OOP, therefore, views a computer program as a collection of largely autonomous components, called objects, each of which is responsible for a specific task. This concept of packaging data, structures, and procedures together in one component or module is called encapsulation.

In general, OOP components are reusable software modules which present an interface that conforms to an object model and which are accessed at run-time through a component integration architecture. A component integration architecture is a set of architecture mechanisms which allow software modules in different process spaces to utilize each others capabilities or functions. This is generally done by assuming a common component object model on which to build the architecture. It is worthwhile to differentiate between an object and a class of objects at this point. An object is a single instance of the class of objects, which is often just called a class. A class of objects can be viewed as a blueprint, from which many objects can be formed.

OOP allows the programmer to create an object that is a part of another object. For example, the object representing a piston engine is said to have a composition-relationship with the object representing a piston. In reality, a piston engine comprises a piston, valves and many other components; the fact that a piston is an element of a piston engine can be logically and semantically represented in OOP by two objects.

OOP also allows creation of an object that “depends from” another object. If there are two objects, one representing a piston engine and the other representing a

piston engine wherein the piston is made of ceramic, then the relationship between the two objects is not that of composition. A ceramic piston engine does not make up a piston engine. Rather it is merely one kind of piston engine that has one more limitation than the piston engine; its piston is made of ceramic. In this case, the object representing the ceramic piston engine is called a derived object, and it inherits all of the aspects of the object representing the piston engine and adds further limitation or detail to it. The object representing the ceramic piston engine “depends from” the object representing the piston engine. The relationship between these objects is called inheritance.

When the object or class representing the ceramic piston engine inherits all of the aspects of the objects representing the piston engine, it inherits the thermal characteristics of a standard piston defined in the piston engine class. However, the ceramic piston engine object overrides these ceramic specific thermal characteristics, which are typically different from those associated with a metal piston. It skips over the original and uses new functions related to ceramic pistons. Different kinds of piston engines have different characteristics, but may have the same underlying functions associated with it (e.g., how many pistons in the engine, ignition sequences, lubrication, etc.). To access each of these functions in any piston engine object, a programmer would call the same functions with the same names, but each type of piston engine may have different/overriding implementations of functions behind the same name. This ability to hide different implementations of a function behind the same name is called polymorphism and it greatly simplifies communication among objects.

With the concepts of composition-relationship, encapsulation, inheritance and polymorphism, an object can represent just about anything in the real world. In fact, one’s logical perception of the reality is the only limit on determining the kinds of things that can become objects in object-oriented software. Some typical categories are as follows:

- Objects can represent physical objects, such as automobiles in a traffic-flow simulation, electrical components in a circuit-design program, countries in an economics model, or aircraft in an air-traffic-control system.
- Objects can represent elements of the computer-user environment such as windows, menus or graphics objects.
- An object can represent an inventory, such as a personnel file or a table of the latitudes and longitudes of cities.
- An object can represent user-defined data types such as time, angles, and complex numbers, or points on the plane.

10

With this enormous capability of an object to represent just about any logically separable matters, OOP allows the software developer to design and implement a computer program that is a model of some aspects of reality, whether that reality is a physical entity, a process, a system, or a composition of matter.

- 15 Since the object can represent anything, the software developer can create an object which can be used as a component in a larger software project in the future.

If 90% of a new OOP software program consists of proven, existing components made from preexisting reusable objects, then only the remaining 10% of the new software project has to be written and tested from scratch. Since 90% already came from an inventory of extensively tested reusable objects, the potential domain from which an error could originate is 10% of the program. As a result, OOP enables software developers to build objects out of other, previously built objects.

25

This process closely resembles complex machinery being built out of assemblies and sub-assemblies. OOP technology, therefore, makes software engineering more like hardware engineering in that software is built from existing components, which are available to the developer as objects. All this adds up to an improved quality of the software as well as an increased speed of its development.

30

Programming languages are beginning to fully support the OOP principles, such as encapsulation, inheritance, polymorphism, and composition-relationship. With the advent of the C++ language, many commercial software developers have embraced OOP. C++ is an OOP language that offers a fast, machine-executable code. Furthermore, C++ is suitable for both commercial-application and systems-programming projects. For now, C++ appears to be the most popular choice among many OOP programmers, but there is a host of other OOP languages, such as Smalltalk, Common Lisp Object System (CLOS), and Eiffel. Additionally, OOP capabilities are being added to more traditional popular computer programming languages such as Pascal.

The benefits of object classes can be summarized, as follows:

- Objects and their corresponding classes break down complex programming problems into many smaller, simpler problems.
- Encapsulation enforces data abstraction through the organization of data into small, independent objects that can communicate with each other. Encapsulation protects the data in an object from accidental damage, but allows other objects to interact with that data by calling the object's member functions and structures.
- Subclassing and inheritance make it possible to extend and modify objects through deriving new kinds of objects from the standard classes available in the system. Thus, new capabilities are created without having to start from scratch.
- Polymorphism and multiple inheritance make it possible for different programmers to mix and match characteristics of many different classes and create specialized objects that can still work with related objects in predictable ways.
- Class hierarchies and containment hierarchies provide a flexible mechanism for modeling real-world objects and the relationships among them.

- Libraries of reusable classes are useful in many situations, but they also have some limitations. For example:
- Complexity. In a complex system, the class hierarchies for related classes can become extremely confusing, with many dozens or even hundreds of classes.
- Flow of control. A program written with the aid of class libraries is still responsible for the flow of control (i.e., it must control the interactions among all the objects created from a particular library). The programmer has to decide which functions to call at what times for which kinds of objects.
- Duplication of effort. Although class libraries allow programmers to use and reuse many small pieces of code, each programmer puts those pieces together in a different way. Two different programmers can use the same set of class libraries to write two programs that do exactly the same thing but whose internal structure (i.e., design) may be quite different, depending on hundreds of small decisions each programmer makes along the way. Inevitably, similar pieces of code end up doing similar things in slightly different ways and do not work as well together as they should.

Class libraries are very flexible. As programs grow more complex, more programmers are forced to reinvent basic solutions to basic problems over and over again. A relatively new extension of the class library concept is to have a framework of class libraries. This framework is more complex and consists of significant collections of collaborating classes that capture both the small scale patterns and major mechanisms that implement the common requirements and design in a specific application domain. They were first developed to free application programmers from the chores involved in displaying menus, windows, dialog boxes, and other standard user interface elements for personal computers.

Frameworks also represent a change in the way programmers think about the interaction between the code they write and code written by others. In the early days

of procedural programming, the programmer called libraries provided by the operating system to perform certain tasks, but basically the program executed down the page from start to finish, and the programmer was solely responsible for the flow of control. This was appropriate for printing out paychecks, calculating a
5 mathematical table, or solving other problems with a program that executed in just one way.

The development of graphical user interfaces began to turn this procedural programming arrangement inside out. These interfaces allow the user, rather than
10 program logic, to drive the program and decide when certain actions should be performed. Today, most personal computer software accomplishes this by means of an event loop which monitors the mouse, keyboard, and other sources of external events and calls the appropriate parts of the programmer's code according to actions that the user performs. The programmer no longer determines the order in which
15 events occur. Instead, a program is divided into separate pieces that are called at unpredictable times and in an unpredictable order. By relinquishing control in this way to users, the developer creates a program that is much easier to use. Nevertheless, individual pieces of the program written by the developer still call libraries provided by the operating system to accomplish certain tasks, and the
20 programmer must still determine the flow of control within each piece after it's called by the event loop. Application code still "sits on top of" the system.

Even event loop programs require programmers to write a lot of code that should not need to be written separately for every application. The concept of an
25 application framework carries the event loop concept further. Instead of dealing with all the nuts and bolts of constructing basic menus, windows, and dialog boxes and then making these things all work together, programmers using application frameworks start with working application code and basic user interface elements in place. Subsequently, they build from there by replacing some of the generic
30 capabilities of the framework with the specific capabilities of the intended application.

Application frameworks reduce the total amount of code that a programmer has to write from scratch. However, because the framework is really a generic application that displays windows, supports copy and paste, and so on, the programmer can also relinquish control to a greater degree than event loop programs permit. The framework code takes care of almost all event handling and flow of control, and the programmer's code is called only when the framework needs it (e.g., to create or manipulate a proprietary data structure).

A programmer writing a framework program not only relinquishes control to the user (as is also true for event loop programs), but also relinquishes the detailed flow of control within the program to the framework. This approach allows the creation of more complex systems that work together in interesting ways, as opposed to isolated programs, having custom code, being created over and over again for similar problems.

Thus, as is explained above, a framework basically is a collection of cooperating classes that make up a reusable design solution for a given problem domain. It typically includes objects that provide default behavior (e.g., for menus and windows), and programmers use it by inheriting some of that default behavior and overriding other behavior so that the framework calls application code at the appropriate times.

- There are three main differences between frameworks and class libraries:
- Behavior versus protocol. Class libraries are essentially collections of behaviors that you can call when you want those individual behaviors in your program. A framework, on the other hand, provides not only behavior but also the protocol or set of rules that govern the ways in which behaviors can be combined, including rules for what a programmer is supposed to provide versus what the framework provides.

- Call versus override. With a class library, the code the programmer instantiates objects and calls their member functions. It's possible to instantiate and call objects in the same way with a framework (i.e., to treat the framework as a class library), but to take full advantage of a framework's reusable design, a programmer typically writes code that overrides and is called by the framework. The framework manages the flow of control among its objects. Writing a program involves dividing responsibilities among the various pieces of software that are called by the framework rather than specifying how the different pieces should work together.
- Implementation versus design. With class libraries, programmers reuse only implementations, whereas with frameworks, they reuse design. A framework embodies the way a family of related programs or pieces of software work. It represents a generic design solution that can be adapted to a variety of specific problems in a given domain. For example, a single framework can embody the way a user interface works, even though two different user interfaces created with the same framework might solve quite different interface problems.

Thus, through the development of frameworks for solutions to various problems and programming tasks, significant reductions in the design and development effort for software can be achieved. A preferred embodiment of the invention utilizes HyperText Markup Language (HTML) to implement documents on the Internet together with a general-purpose secure communication protocol for a transport medium between the client and the Newco. HTTP or other protocols could be readily substituted for HTML without undue experimentation. Information on these products is available in T. Berners-Lee, D. Connolly, "RFC 1866: Hypertext Markup Language - 2.0" (Nov. 1995); and R. Fielding, H. Frystyk, T. Berners-Lee, J. Gettys and J.C. Mogul, "Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1: HTTP Working Group Internet Draft" (May 2, 1996). HTML is a simple data format used to create hypertext documents that are portable from one platform to another. HTML documents are SGML documents with generic semantics that are appropriate for

5

10

- 15

by:

- 20

25

Sun's Java language has emerged as an industry-recognized language for "programming the Internet." Sun defines Java as: "a simple, object-oriented, distributed, interpreted, robust, secure, architecture-neutral, portable, high-performance, multithreaded, dynamic, buzzword-compliant, general-purpose programming language. Java supports programming for the Internet in the form of platform-independent Java applets." Java applets are small, specialized applications that comply with Sun's Java Application Programming Interface (API) allowing developers to add "interactive content" to Web documents (e.g., simple animations, page adornments, basic games, etc.). Applets execute within a Java-compatible browser (e.g., Netscape Navigator) by copying code from the server to client. From a language standpoint, Java's core feature set is based on C++. Sun's Java literature states that Java is basically, "C++ with extensions from Objective C for more dynamic method resolution."

Another technology that provides similar function to JAVA is provided by Microsoft and ActiveX Technologies, to give developers and Web designers wherewithal to build dynamic content for the Internet and personal computers. ActiveX includes tools for developing animation, 3-D virtual reality, video and other multimedia content. The tools use Internet standards, work on multiple platforms, and are being supported by over 100 companies. The group's building blocks are called ActiveX Controls, small, fast components that enable developers to embed parts of software in hypertext markup language (HTML) pages. ActiveX Controls work with a variety of programming languages including Microsoft Visual C++, Borland Delphi, Microsoft Visual Basic programming system and, in the future, Microsoft's development tool for Java, code named "Jakarta." ActiveX Technologies also includes ActiveX Server Framework, allowing developers to create server applications. One of ordinary skill in the art readily recognizes that ActiveX could be substituted for JAVA without undue experimentation to practice the invention.

It should be noted that, in one embodiment, the information database and the common displays may all be treated as objects by the platform. As such, the foregoing technology may be utilized in the implementation of the overall system, as embodied in Figure 1d.

5

Preferred Embodiment

The platform of the present embodiment acts as a “decision engine” which drives the decision process through a sequence of logical steps to a conclusion. The users’ interface during these steps is the set of common displays exhibited by the platform. The users receive and provide specific decision information to the platform by entering or modifying the structure of the decision and the decision-relevant information in the display areas where appropriate. In order to start the process, the platform hosts a decision application which provides the structure for the type of decision that the user wants to make. The application and platform communicate through a standard interface protocol. The platform guides the user through four steps (framing, alternatives, analysis and connection), but these are tailored to the decision at hand through the decision application.

Figure 3 illustrates an example of Framing 300 in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. The purpose of Framing is to clearly communicate to the users the capabilities of the chosen decision application 124 and to allow the users to modify the problem definition to the extent that the capability for modification has been incorporated by the authors of the application. During Framing, the specific decision application provides certain key pieces of information about the decision at hand as input in a specific format or protocol 125 specified by the collaborative decision platform 122 that describe the capabilities of that application. Such input may include the policies that form boundary conditions for the decision, the strategic decisions that can be made, the values that are important to the decision makers, the uncertainties that may impact the values desired, and the relationship of the above elements.

The Framing process, using this key input from the decision application 124 in the specific format 125, generates visual displays of a decision hierarchy 304 and an influence diagram 306, to be confirmed or modified by the users. The users'

5 information 129 is seen as an input to the framing process 300, because the users interact with the platform 122 to produce a resultant decision hierarchy 304 and the influence diagram 306 that capture their collective view of the decision problem. Note the two-headed arrow representing the users' interface 128 with the collaborative decision platform 122 to indicate the interaction, while the single
10 arrow head of the interface 125 indicates input. In the event that the users are unable to successfully represent the decision problem as they see it with the initial decision application, they will select another application 124 and repeat the Framing process 300.

15 Figure 3a illustrates various logic 310 associated with the Framing process of the present invention. As shown, a first Framing module 314 receives information from the decision application 124, such as the specific policies, decisions (controllables) and tactics that it can accommodate with a logical structure. The first framing module 314 orders the precedence of decisions to output the decision
20 hierarchy 304. Decisions that have already been made are referred to as "policy," a set of one or more decisions of immediate interest are referred to as "strategy" or "strategic decisions" or just "decisions," and decisions that can be deferred until later are referred to as "tactics." The users confirm or modify 129 the policies, decisions and tactics. For example, the users may not want to address a particular decision at
25 this time, in which case it would become a tactic.

Working in parallel with the first Framing module 314 is a second Framing module 316. Such second Framing module 316 receives as input pertinent uncertainties or risks (uncontrollables), information sources and values that further
30 describe the capabilities of the decision application 124. The second Framing

module **316** also receives as input the decisions identified by the first Framing module **314** and users' confirmation or modification **129** of the values, information sources and uncertainties. With such, the second Framing module **316** structures a relationship of decisions, values and uncertainties in form of the influence diagram
5 and a corresponding directory to sources of information **306**.

Figure **4** illustrates an example of Alternatives **400** in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. The purpose of the Alternatives process is to develop a set of strategic alternatives that capture the range of possibilities
10 envisioned by the users. After Framing, the platform moves to Alternatives, and receives from the decision application **124** alternative strategies each comprised of a set of coherent choices for each of the strategic decision. The users confirm or modify **129** the alternative strategies. The platform generates the visual display of the strategies defined on a strategy table **402**.

15 Figure **4a** illustrates various logic **406** associated with the Alternatives process of the present invention which is capable of generating several strategies defined on a strategy table **402**. Included with the Alternatives logic **406** is a first Alternatives module **410** that receives the decision hierarchy **304** generated by the Framing logic **310**. The first Alternatives module **410** obtains decision alternatives
20 in each of the decision areas from the decision application **124** and from an information database **126** for the purpose of developing a strategy table. Each (strategic) decision from the decision hierarchy **304** becomes a column heading in the strategy table **402** with the alternatives for that decision arranged in a column beneath it. The first Alternatives module **410** also takes as input the users
25 confirmation or modification **129** of the decision alternatives.

A second Alternatives module **412** combines the strategy table output of the first Alternatives module **410** with strategy descriptions from the decision
30 application **124**. The strategy descriptions include a strategy name and the selection

of one alternative for each of the decisions that comprise the column headings in the strategy table **402**. The second Alternatives module **412** can then display the strategies on a strategy table and incorporate the users' confirmation or modifications **129**. For example, the users may want to define their own strategy, which they would do by providing the second Alternatives module **412** with a strategy name and the selection of an alternative in each column of the strategy table **402**.

Figure **5** illustrates an example of Analysis **500** in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. The purpose of the Analysis process is to enable the users to have a shared understanding of the significant sources of risk and value in each of the initially defined alternative strategies. During Analysis, the platform prompts the information database **126** for assessments on each of the uncertainties set forth in a format **127** specified as low estimate, nominal estimate, and high estimate. These assessments are made for uncertainties influenced by the choice of decision, as well as independent uncertainties.

Using the information generated previously and the model structure of the decision application **124**, the platform makes the necessary calculations to output tornado diagrams **502** and decision sensitivity output displays for each of the alternative strategies **509**. The users confirm or modify the input information **129** and structure from the decision application **124**. The tornado diagrams identify the sources of significant risk in each alternative strategy and the decision sensitivity identifies the sources of significant value in each alternative strategy.

Figure **5a** illustrates various logic **506** associated with the Analysis process of the present invention. As shown, a first Analysis module **508** receives as input the influence diagram **306**, identifying uncertainties and their relationship to the value and the decisions. The influence diagram also includes an information directory, which specifies the information databases **126** that will provide the

decision-relevant information. This first Analysis module **508** also receives as input from the information data bases **126** assessed ranges or probabilities for each of the uncertainties identified by the influence diagram **306** generated using the Framing logic **310**. These data ranges are confirmed or modified by the users **129**.

5

The output of the first Analysis module **508** is further used by a second Analysis module **514**. The second Analysis module **514** takes as input the structural relationship of decisions, values and uncertainties from the decision application **124**. An example of such a structural relationship is a spreadsheet comprised of equations relating decisions, values and uncertainties. This output is, in turn, used to generate the tornado diagram **502** by varying each of the uncertainties over its range and recording the effect on value.

10

In parallel with the first and second Analysis modules is a third Analysis module **510** that takes as input the strategies defined on the strategy table **402**, the output of the first Analysis module **508** and the structural relationship of decisions, values and uncertainties from the decision application **124**. With such input, the third Analysis module **510** identifies a contribution to the total value of each alternative for each decision that comprises each strategy. Given this information, a decision sensitivity table **509** may be constructed.

15

20

Figure **6** illustrates an example of Connection **600** in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. The purpose of Connection is for the users to develop a new, more valuable “hybrid” strategy **602** combining the most valuable decisions in each of the initially defined alternative strategies. During Connection, the users’ insight into the sources of risk and value **129** interacts with new decision relevant information from the database **126** and the decision structure provided by the decision application **124** to output an evaluation of the hybrid strategy **602**.

25

Figure 6a illustrates various logic 604 associated with the Connection process of the present invention. As shown, the logic 604 includes a first Connection module 606 which receives as input a value contribution of each alternative for each decision that comprise each strategy, the decision sensitivity 509 generated by the Analysis logic 506. The first connection module 606 also receives as input user insight 129 regarding how to combine the sources of value into a new, more valuable hybrid strategy. A second logic module 608 of the connection logic 604 takes as input the users' insight about additional information sources that could reduce the significant uncertainties or risks identified in the tornado diagram 502. This second Connection module 608 then selects that new information from an appropriate decision relevant database (perhaps one not previously used for this decision problem) 126. The description of the new hybrid alternative from the first Connection module 606 and the new risk reducing information from the second Connection module 608 are input to a third module 610. This third module 610 uses the structural relationship of decisions, values and uncertainties (e.g., spreadsheet) from the decision application 124 to output the value of the hybrid strategy 602.

Figure 7 illustrates the various logical connectivity among the various common displays of the Framing, Alternatives, Analysis, and Connection that comprise the users' interface 128.

Figures 8a-i illustrate an example of an application of the various logic components set forth in Figures 3-7. As shown, such illustrative application of the collaborative decision platform relates to an individual and his/her spouse, the users, selecting a strategy for participation in an employer's stock purchase program. Initially, the collaborative decision platform executes a decision application selected by the users for developing stock purchase strategies.

In the Framing process, the collaborative decision platform uses input from the decision application to present the users with an initial decision hierarchy, which

the users confirm or modify. The collaborative decision platform produces the resulting decision hierarchy **800**, shown in Figure **8a**, as an output, which identifies the decisions that are within the scope of the current decision making process.

5 The collaborative decision platform also uses input from the decision application to present the users with an initial influence diagram, which the users confirm or modify. The influence diagram identifies the critical uncertainties or risks, the decisions and the values that are important to the users, and it displays the relationships among them. The users confirm or modify the influence diagram. The
10 collaborative decision platform produces the resulting influence diagram **802**, shown in Figure **8b**, as another output. Note that a directory of information sources **803** is included with the influence diagram.

 The users are allowed to modify the influence diagram and the decision
15 hierarchy only to the extent that the modifications were anticipated by the author of the application. This restriction assures that the alternative strategies that are defined in the Alternatives process can be analyzed with the spreadsheet provided by the decision application.

20 In the Alternatives process, the collaborative decision platform uses input from the decision application to present the users with an initial strategy table that is consistent with the decision hierarchy, which the users confirm or modify. One or more strategy names and their corresponding definitions on the strategy table are also presented to the users. The users may confirm or modify the strategies,
25 including developing new strategies. The resulting strategy alternatives are displayed on strategy tables **804**, as shown in Figures **8c** and **8d**.

 In the Analysis process, ranges on each uncertainty or risk **806** are input from the decision-relevant database specified on the influence diagram **802**, as shown in
30 Figure **8e**. The users may confirm or modify the ranges. The collaborative decision platform takes as input the spreadsheet residing in the decision application that

5

10

15

20

30

The customer-centric collaborative protocol exploits a commonality in the attributes of the value structure of many enterprises that is sufficient to assess the implications of many decisions. An illustrative minimum set of attributes could include: price, sales, variable cost, fixed cost and investment. For many strategic decisions, knowing the affect of the decision on these attributes enables the enterprise to make an informed decision.

There are well-defined algorithms for the hierarchical expansion of each of the attributes in the minimum set in the event additional detail is required. When more detail is required, it may be nested within the higher level attributes. An expanded set of attributes could include: price, market share, market size, labor cost, material cost, administrative cost, annual expenses, working capital, plant and equipment, etc. The protocol or structure of the informational requirement is identical for a wide range of enterprises and many decisions within those enterprises, but the relative value of each attribute will be different. Figure 9a illustrates a table 920 showing various customer-centric collaborative (C^3) attributes, and the value of a one-percent increases of such attributes in two different industries.

In accordance with the present invention, the supplying enterprise is required to describe its alternatives in terms of their effect on the value attributes that matter to the receiving enterprise. Figure 10 illustrates a table 1000 showing such an effect on the value attributes.

Figure 11 is a schematic diagram showing the customer-centric collaborative (C^3) protocol. As set forth hereinabove, the protocol defines the minimum informational requirement for decision making between enterprises (B2B). The value of improvements of each of the attributes is specified for a receiving enterprise 1100. It should be noted that attributes are easily calculable for enterprises that focus on profit. However, even for enterprises that are not focused on profit, these same attributes are of critical importance. A supplying enterprise 1102 provides one

or more alternative “attribute bundles” that describe products and services it is willing to deliver in terms of the attributes that matter to the receiving enterprise. An attribute bundle specifies how much of each attribute will be provided. It should be understood that the attribute levels can be assessed with little difficulty, using for example an influence diagram. A decision module **1104** may then execute the method **900** of Figure 9. Figure **12** illustrates a first example **1200** of the embodiment set forth in Figure **11**. As shown, an industry independent, open and scalable platform may be provided that uses the customer-centric collaborative protocol for real-time, remote collaborative decision making among enterprises. The customer-centric collaborative protocol can be used with an architecture or process that supports collaborative decision-making, such as a collaborative decision platform **1202** which is similar to that set forth hereinabove.

Figures **13** and **14** illustrate a second and third example **1300** and **1400** of the embodiment set forth in Figure **11**. In the embodiment of Figure **13**, the customer-centric collaborative protocol and an architecture or process that supports collaborative decision making, such as the collaborative decision platform, may together enable an open, scalable, industry independent process for real-time, remote decision-making between a receiving enterprise **1302** and a supplying enterprise **1304**. As shown, the present embodiment may serve to negotiate an agreement **1306** to purchase and deliver the highest value combination of attributes. In a third embodiment shown in Figure **14**, the customer-centric collaborative protocol and an architecture or process that supports collaborative decision making, such as the collaborative decision platform, may together enable an open, scalable, industry independent process for real-time, remote decision-making among a receiving enterprise **1402** and supplying enterprises **1404**. As shown, the present embodiment may serve to negotiate an agreement **1406** to purchase and deliver the highest value combination of attributes.

Figure **15** illustrates a fourth examples **1500** of the embodiment set forth in Figure **11**, where an industry independent, open and scalable platform is provided for

B2B exchange of existing goods and services that are not commodities. In other words, an effective platform for a non-commodity exchange is afforded.

As shown in Figure 15, the alternative attribute bundle can be offered by
5 different enterprises 1504 to a receiving enterprise 1502 and need not be
commodities, but rather may differ on the level offered of every attribute. It should
be understood that commodities are goods and services that can be defined without
the information about or the interaction of the customer. As shown in Figure 15, the
customer-centric collaborative protocol and an architecture or process that supports
10 collaborative decision making, such as the collaborative decision platform, together
enable an industry-independent, open and scalable platform for the real-time
B2B exchange of existing goods and services 1502 that are not commodities.

Figure 16 illustrates a fifth example 1600 of the embodiment set forth in
15 Figure 11, where an industry independent, open and scalable platform is provided for
B2B real-time collaboration in the definition of future, non-existent goods and
services 1601. As shown in Figure 16, the alternative attribute bundles can be
offered by different enterprises and need not exist. Rather, they may represent
proposals to deliver goods and services that could be developed in the future. As
20 shown, an agreement 1606 may be negotiated to deliver the highest value
combination of attributes in the future. Figures 17 and 18 illustrate sixth and
seventh examples 1700 and 1800, respectively, of the embodiment set forth in
Figure 11, where a new business design is provided that assists B2B enterprises in
measuring the value creation for its customers.

25

As shown in Figure 17, the customer-centric collaborative protocol and
publicly available information 1702 may together enable a new business design that
assists B2B enterprises in measuring the prospective value creation for its customers.
With reference to Figure 18, a particular embodiment of that business design could
30 include the customer-centric collaborative protocol, publicly available information

1702 and a collaborative decision platform **1802**, which together enable a new business design that assists B2B enterprises in measuring the retrospective value creation for its customers.

5 An exemplary application of a customer-centric collaborative protocol
utilizing the collaborative decision platform for the selection of a strategy for
“Customer Relationship Management (CRM)” will now be set forth. In particular,
the present B2B example relates to a receiving enterprise desirous of an improved
CRM strategy and a supplying enterprise capable of delivering alternative CRM
10 strategies.

In this case during the Framing process, the receiving enterprise provides the policies, which constrain the strategic alternatives. The supplying enterprise demonstrates its experience by offering a list of strategic decisions. The receiving enterprise believes that two of the decisions are tactical, i.e. can be made later. Figure 19 illustrates the resulting decision hierarchy 1900 developed collaboratively and asynchronously. Figure 20 shows the influence diagram 2000, which identifies the critical uncertainties, the strategic decisions and the attributes 2020 that are of value to the receiving enterprise and which display the relationship among them. For two of the attributes, more detail is required and the higher level attributes are expanded hierarchically in those areas 2100 and 2200, as shown in Figures 21 and 22, respectively.

During the Alternatives process, three alternative strategies **2300**, **2302**, and **2304** are defined collaboratively on a strategy table in terms of the strategic decisions, as shown in Figure **23a**, **23b** and **23c**, respectively. The strategy table is developed remotely and asynchronously. The strategies are developed in the physical presence of both enterprises.

30 In the Analysis process, the supplying enterprise uses information from its database to assess the range of effect that the "Revenue Growth" strategy will have

on each of the attributes **2410**. Note **2400** in Figure **24**. Similar assessments are made for each of the other strategies. The receiving enterprise may establish its value for changes in each of the attributes as shown in the table **2500** of Figure **25**.

5 The table **2600** in Figure **26** shows the calculations performed inside the collaborative decision platform when the customer-centric collaborative protocol is used. As shown, the value of an alternative to the client can be estimated by multiplying the improvement in each attribute by the customer's value for changes in that attribute.

10 The remarkable simplicity of these calculations enables shared insight into the sources of risk and sources of value, which is displayed in the tornado diagram **2700** and decision sensitivity **2800** for each of the alternative strategies, as shown in Figures **27** and **28**, respectively. It should be noted that different solutions might be
15 appropriate for clients in different industries because of different client values for the C^3 attributes.

 Using the shared understanding of the sources of risk and value in the initially defined alternative strategies, the supplying and receiving enterprise
20 collaborate in developing a new, more valuable "hybrid" strategy **2900**, as shown in Figure **29**. Its corresponding decision sensitivity **3000** of Figure **30** compares the total value of the hybrid strategy with the initially defined alternatives and identifies its sources of value.

25 While various embodiments have been described above, it should be understood that they have been presented by way of example only, and not limitation. Thus, the breadth and scope of a preferred embodiment should not be limited by any of the above-described exemplary embodiments, but should be defined only in accordance with the following claims and their equivalents.

30

CLAIMS

What is claimed is:

- 1 1. A method for providing customer-centric collaborative decision making in a
2 business-to-business framework, comprising the steps of:
 - 3 (a) defining a minimum set of attributes;
 - 4 (b) receiving first information regarding each of the minimum set of attributes
5 from a receiving business;
 - 6 (c) receiving second information regarding proposed products or services in
7 terms of the minimum set of attributes, wherein the second information is
8 received from a supplying business;
 - 9 (d) executing a decision process based on the first information and the second
10 information as to which products or services is suitable for the receiving
11 business.
- 1 2. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the attributes include price, sales,
2 variable costs, fixed cost, and investment.
- 1 3. The method as recited in claim 2, wherein the attributes further include
2 market share, market size, labor cost, material cost, administrative cost,
3 annual expenses, working capital, planning and equipment.
- 1 4. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the first information and second
2 information are received utilizing a network.
- 1 5. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the network is the Internet.

1 6. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the steps are carried out using a
2 system capable of:
3 (a) executing an application capable of performing decision logic;
4 (b) retrieving information from a database in accordance with the decision logic;
5 (c) receiving information from a user in accordance with the decision logic
6 utilizing a user interface;
7 (d) processing the information utilizing the decision logic; and
8 (e) wherein steps (a)-(d) are carried out by a collaborative decision platform
9 capable of accomplishing steps (b)-(d) for different purposes by executing
10 different applications each capable of performing different decision logic.

1 7. A computer program product for providing customer-centric collaborative
2 decision making in a business-to-business framework, comprising:
3 (a) computer code for defining a minimum set of attributes;
4 (b) computer code for receiving first information regarding each of the minimum
5 set of attributes from a receiving business;
6 (c) computer code for receiving second information regarding proposed products
7 or services in terms of the minimum set of attributes, wherein the second
8 information is received from a supplying business;
9 (d) computer code for executing a decision process based on the first information
10 and the second information as to which products or services is suitable for
11 the receiving business.

1 8. The computer program product as recited in claim 7, wherein the attributes
2 include price, sales, variable costs, fixed cost, and investment.

1 9. The computer program product as recited in claim 8, wherein the attributes
2 further include market share, market size, labor cost, material cost,
3 administrative cost, annual expenses, working capital, planning and
4 equipment.

- 1 10. The computer program product as recited in claim 7, wherein the first
2 information and second information are received utilizing a network.
- 1 11. The computer program product as recited in claim 7, wherein the network is
2 the Internet.
- 1 12. The computer program product as recited in claim 7, wherein the computer
2 code is executed using a system capable of:
3 (a) executing an application capable of performing decision logic;
4 (b) retrieving information from a database in accordance with the decision logic;
5 (c) receiving information from a user in accordance with the decision logic
6 utilizing a user interface;
7 (d) processing the information utilizing the decision logic; and
8 (e) wherein steps (a)-(d) are carried out by a collaborative decision platform
9 capable of accomplishing steps (b)-(d) for different purposes by executing
10 different applications each capable of performing different decision logic.
- 1 13. A system for providing customer-centric collaborative decision making in a
2 business-to-business framework, comprising:
3 (a) logic for defining a minimum set of attributes;
4 (b) logic for receiving first information regarding each of the minimum set of
5 attributes from a receiving business;
6 (c) logic for receiving second information regarding proposed products or
7 services in terms of the minimum set of attributes, wherein the second
8 information is received from a supplying business;
9 (d) logic for executing a decision process based on the first information and the
10 second information as to which products or services is suitable for the
11 receiving business.
- 1 14. The system as recited in claim 13, wherein the attributes include price, sales,
2 variable costs, fixed cost, and investment.

09/03/2014 11:07:00

- 1 15. The system as recited in claim 14, wherein the attributes further include
2 market share, market size, labor cost, material cost, administrative cost,
3 annual expenses, working capital, planning and equipment.
- 1 16. The system as recited in claim 13, wherein the first information and second
2 information are received utilizing a network.
- 1 17. The system as recited in claim 13, wherein the network is the Internet.

09/08/24 14:00
00/00 44280/60

SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR A COLLABORATIVE PROTOCOL

ABSTRACT

A system, method and computer program product are provided for affording customer-centric collaborative decision making in a business-to-business framework. Initially, a minimum set of attributes is defined. Thereafter, first information regarding each of the minimum set of attributes is received from a receiving business. Second information is then received regarding proposed products or services in terms of the minimum set of attributes. Such second information is received from a supplying business. In use, a decision process is executed based on the first information and the second information as to which products or services is suitable for the receiving business.

05703344-140700




Fig. 1a




Fig. 1b




Fig. 1c




Fig. 1d




Fig. 1e




Fig. 2

Fig. 3




Fig. 3a




Fig. 5




Fig. 6




Fig. 6a





Fig. 7






Fig. 8a






Fig. 8b



Strategy Table		
Strategy Name	Initial Participation July 1, 2000	Participation Adjustment Jan 1, 2001
No Participation	0%	0%
In and Out	5%	5%
Out and In	7%	7%
	10%	10%

Fig. 8c



Strategy Table		
Strategy Name	Initial Participation July 1, 2000	Participation Adjustment Jan 1, 2001
No Participation	0%	0%
In and Out	5%	5%
Out and In	7%	7%
	10%	10%

Fig. 8d




Fig. 8e




Fig. 8f





Fig. 8g

804




Strategy Table		
Strategy Name	Initial Participation July 1, 2000	Participation Jan 1, 2001
No Participation	0%	0%
In and Out	5%	5%
Out and In	7%	7%
Maximum Contribution	10%	10%



811

Fig. 8h

Decision Sensitivity



812

Fig. 8i




Fig. 9

C ³ Attribute	Value of one percent increase in C ³ Attribute	
	Typical Automotive Manufacturer	Typical Information Technology Company
Revenue (\$M)	200	15
COGS (\$M)	75	35
SG&A (\$M)	20	40
Inventory Turns	12	15
Receivable Turns	2	2

Fig. 9a

1000

C ³ Attribute	Percent increase in C ³ Attribute	
	<u>Alternative 1:</u> Improve Supply Chain Management	<u>Alternative 2:</u> Installation of Customer Relationship Management system
Revenue	0	5
COGS	-4	0
SG&A	-1	0
Inventory Turns	+5	0
Receivable Turns	+1	+2

Fig. 10




Fig. 11




Fig. 13




Fig. 14




Fig. 15




Fig. 16




Fig. 17




Fig. 18




Fig. 19




Fig. 20




Fig. 21




Fig. 22

Strategy Table

Strategy Name	Target Customers	Enterprise	Contact Center Personalization	Contact Center Operations	Sales Force Channel	Service Channel	Sales/Service Automation	New
Momentum	Current	Current	One Size Fits All	Outsource	Outsource	Outsource	None	
Low Cost	Lifetime Value	New Region	Selected Segments	Current	Tele Sales	Tele Sales	Multiple Legacy	
Increased Value	Deselect	Global	All Segments	Consolidate	Indirect	Indirect	Package	
	Consolidate Segments		Every Contact	Improve Efficiency	Direct	Direct	Process Based	
	Needs/Wants			New	Combined	Combined		
					Portal	Portal		
Add Strategy								
Reset Strategy								

Fig. 23a

Strategy Table

Strategy Name	Target Customers	Enterprise Reach	Contact Center Personalization	Contact Center Operations	Sales Force Channel	Service Channel	Sales/Service Automation	New
Momentum	Current	Current	One Size Fits All	Outsource	Outsource	Outsource	None	
Low Cost	Lifetime Value	New Region	Selected Segments	Current	Tele Sales	Tele Sales	Multiple Legacy	
Increased Value	Deselect	Global	All Segments	Consolidate	Indirect	Indirect	Package	
	Consolidate Segments		Every Contact	Improve Efficiency	Direct	Direct	Process Based	
	Needs/Wants			New	Combined	Combined		
					Portal	Portal		
Add Strategy								
Reset Strategy								

Fig. 23b

Strategy Table

Strategy Name	Target Customers	Enterprise Reach	Contact Center Personalization	Contact Center Operations	Sales Force Channel	Service Channel	Sales/Service Automation	New
Momentum	Current	Current	One Size Fits All	Outsource	Outsource	Outsource	None	
Low Cost	Lifetime Value	New Region	Selected Segments	Current	Tele Sales	Tele Sales	Multiple Legacy	
Increased Value	Deselect	Global	All Segments	Consolidate	Indirect	Indirect	Package	
	Consolidate Segments		Every Contact	Improve Efficiency	Direct	Direct	Process Based	
	Needs/Wants			New	Combined	Combined		
					Portal	Portal		
Add Strategy								
Reset Strategy								

Fig. 23c




Fig. 24

C3 Attribute	Value of a one percent increase in the C3 attribute	Value of a one percent increase in the C3 attribute
	Typical New Vehicle for Automotive manufacturer (\$ Millions/year)	Typical new software product for technology company (\$ Millions/year)
Sales Volume (units)	100	40
Variable Margin (%)	170	15
Investment Cost (\$)	-20	-3
Fixed Cost (\$)	-10	-30




Fig. 25

C3 Attribute	Value of a one percent increase in the C3 attribute for a typical New Vehicle for Automotive manufacturer (\$ Millions/year)	Alternative 3: Best Buy/ Cost -Driven (Percent increase in the C3 attribute)	Total value for C3 attribute increase (\$ Millions/year)
Sales Volume (units)	100	+2	200
Variable Margin (%)	170	+1	170
Investment Cost (\$)	-20	+2	-40
Fixed Cost (\$)	-10	+2	-20
Total			310

2600




Fig. 26

2700




Fig. 27

2800




Fig. 28

2900

Strategy Table

Strategy Name	Target Customers	Enterprise Reach	Contact Center Personalization	Contact Center Operations	Sales Force Channel	Service Channel	Sales/Service Automation	New
Momentum	Current	Current	One Size Fits All	Outsource	Outsource	Outsource	None	
Low Cost	Lifetime Value	New Region	Selected Segments	Current	Tele Sales	Tele Sales	Multiple Legacy	
Increased Value	Deselect	Global	All Segments	Consolidate	Indirect	Indirect	Package	
Hybrid	Consolidate Segments		Every Contact	Improve Efficiency	Direct	Direct	Process Based	
	Needs/Wants			New	Combined	Combined		
Add Strategy					Portal	Portal		
Reset Strategy								

Fig. 29




Fig. 30

3000

DECLARATION AND POWER OF ATTORNEY FOR ORIGINAL U.S. PATENT APPLICATION

Attorney's Docket No. STRATP002

As a below-named inventor, I hereby declare that:

My residence, post office address and citizenship are as stated below next to my name.

I believe that I am the original, first and sole inventor (if only one name is listed below) or an original, first and joint inventor (if plural names are listed below) of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought on the invention entitled:

SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR A CUSTOMER-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE PROTOCOL, the specification of which,

(check one)

1. ☒ is attached hereto.

2. ☐ was filed on _____ as
U.S. Application Serial No. _____
and was amended on _____.

3. ☐ was filed on _____ as
International PCT Application Serial No. _____
and was amended on _____.

I hereby state that I have reviewed and understand the contents of the above-identified specification, including the claims, as amended by any amendment referred to above.

I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to the examination of this application in accordance with Title 37, CFR § 1.56.

I hereby claim foreign priority benefits under Title 35, United States code, § 119(a)-(d) or § 365(b) of any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate, or § 365(a) of any PCT International application which designated at least one country other than the United States, listed below and have identified below, by checking the box, any foreign application for patent or inventor's certificate, or PCT International application having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed:

Prior Foreign Application(s)

Priority Benefits Claimed?

☐ Yes ☐ No

(Appl. No.)

(Country)

(Filing Date)

☐ Yes ☐ No

(Appl. No.)

(Country)

(Filing Date)

☐ Yes ☐ No

(Appl. No.)

(Country)

(Filing Date)

I hereby claim the benefit under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) of any United States provisional application(s) listed below:

60/163,984
(Application Serial No.)

11/8/99
(Filing Date)

(Application Serial No.)

(Filing Date)

I hereby claim the benefit under Title 35, United States Code, § 120 of any United States application(s), or § 365(c) of any PCT International application designating the United States, listed below and, insofar as the subject matter of each of the claims of this application is not disclosed in the prior United States or PCT International application in the manner provided by the first paragraph of Title 35, United States Code, § 112, I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to patentability as defined in Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, § 1.56 which became available between the filing date of the prior application and the national or PCT international filing date of this application:

Prior U.S. Application(s)

(Application Serial No.)

(Filing Date)

(Status - patented, pending, abandoned)

(Application Serial No.)

(Filing Date)

(Status - patented, pending, abandoned)

And I hereby appoint **Kevin J. Zilka (Reg. No. 41,429)** as my principal agent to prosecute this application and to transact all business in the Patent and Trademark Office connected therewith:

Send Correspondence To:

**Kevin J. Zilka
P.O. BOX 721030
San Jose, California 95172-1030**

Direct Telephone Calls To:

Kevin J. Zilka at telephone number (408) 505-5100

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.

Typewritten Full Name of

Sole or First Inventor:

Daniel L. Owen

Citizenship:

USA

Inventor's signature:

Daniel Owen

Date of Signature:

11/03/00

Residence:

(City) Los Altos

(State/Country)

California

/USA

Post Office Address:

289 Quinnhill, Los Altos, CA 94024

Full Name of Second Joint

Inventor (if any):

Michael W. Kusnic

Citizenship:

USA

Inventor's signature:

MW Kusnic

Date of Signature:

11/05/00

Residence:

(City) Old Tappan

(State/Country)

New Jersey

/USA

Post Office Address:

23 Edith Street, Old Tappan, NJ 07675